

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested. Claims 16 and 25-36 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 1, 7, 13, 17, 18, and 20 have been amended. Claims 37-48 are new. Claims 1-15, 17-24, and 37-48 are presently pending. Claims 1, 13, and 37 are independent.

In the Office Action dated November 16, 2004, claims 1-3, 5-8, 10, 13, 14, 16-18, 20-23, and 25-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 3,819,138 to Rehkopf et al. (the "Rehkopf et al. '138 patent"). Claims 4, 9, 11, 12, 15, 19, 24, and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Rehkopf et al. '138 patent in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,476,961 to Luigi et al. (the "Luigi et al. '961 patent"). However, Applicant respectfully submits that none of the prior art references of record, when considered singly or in combination, show or suggest the use of the structure recited in the claims.

Amended claim 1 recites a wheel chock for preventing rotation of a wheel relative to a ground surface, wherein the wheel includes a rim and a tire. The wheel chock includes, among other things, a body to prevent the wheel from rotating in the direction of the body. The body includes a pair of spaced sidewalls and a rear wall. The body presents a leading edge adapted to engage the tire and the ground surface when the body is placed under the wheel. The leading edge is oppositely spaced from the rear wall and extends between the sidewalls. The leading edge is arcuate so as to define a mid-section that is recessed relative to the sidewalls.

The structure recited in claim 1 enables a wheel chock that may be placed in and removed from a secure engagement position under a wheel without the application of undue force. Another advantage of the wheel chock is that it allows the wheel to engage the chock while reducing unwanted vehicle settling movement. This is obtained by the leading edge engaging the tire and the ground surface so that the tire advantageously engages the leading edge from a substantially vertical direction.

Amended claim 13 recites a pair of wheel chocks including, among other things, a body to prevent a wheel from rotating in the direction of the body. The body includes a pair of sidewalls, a back wall, and a wheel-supporting surface extending between the side and back walls. The wheel-supporting surface defines a surface area. The body defines an interior chamber between the walls and surface and an open face that communicates with the chamber. The open face defines a face area that is greater than the surface area so that the wheel-supporting surface of one chock can be received through the open face and partially within the interior chamber of the other chock. The open face has a perimeter. The body further includes a supporting leg extending through the internal chamber between the wheel-supporting surface and the open face to present a ground-engaging section spaced within the perimeter.

The structure recited in claim 13 enables a pair of wheel chocks that are stackable, while providing each of the chocks with a supporting leg that more evenly distributes the load through the chock and increases the ground-engaging surface area.

New independent claim 37 recites a wheel chock for preventing rotation of a wheel, wherein the chock includes, among other things, a body to prevent the wheel from rotating in the direction of the body. The body includes a wheel-supporting surface sloping upwardly and rearwardly from a forwardmost tire-engaging edge. The tire-engaging edge is adapted to engage the tire when the body is placed under the wheel. The tire-engaging edge presents spaced apart side margins and a central recessed section that extends rearwardly between the side margins.

The structure recited in new claim 37 provides numerous advantages over conventional wheel chock designs. For example, the structure recited in claim 37 permits the chock to be placed in and removed from a secure engagement position under a wheel without the application of undue force.

Turning now to the prior art references of record, the Rehkopf et al. '138 patent discloses a chock cradle for supporting a tank with circumferential reinforcing ribs. The cradle includes a pair of chocks 10. Each of the chocks 10 have a wall 14 on each side, a lower end wall 16, and a higher opposite end wall 18. The side walls 14 and the higher end wall 18 include grooved portions 17 and 19 for additional strength. A chock support surface extends upwardly from the lower end wall 16 to the end wall 18. The support surface has a groove portion 22 and flanged portions 24 on both sides of the groove portion 22 to accommodate a tank with rigid circumferential ribs.

The Rehkopf et al. '138 patent fails to show or suggest the use of structure recited in independent claims 1. For example, the Rehkopf et al. '138 patent fails to show or suggest a wheel

chock having an arcuate leading edge adapted to engage a tire and a ground surface when the body of the chock is placed under the wheel. Instead, the Rehkopf et al. '138 patent shows a flange base 12 extending around the perimeter of each of the chocks. The flange base 12 engages the underlying surface (e.g., the ground) and, more importantly, has straight edges rather than arcuate edges. In the Action, the end wall 16 is identified as the structure corresponding to the leading edge recited in claim 1. The end wall 16 is flat and does not present an arcuate shape. The edge defined at the junction of the end wall 16 and flange base 12 is likewise flat. Although the edge defined at the junction of the end wall 16 and top wall 20 presents a downwardly concave shape, the edge is not adapted to engage the ground.

The Rehkopf et al. '138 patent also fails to show or suggest the use of structure recited in amended claim 13. The Rehkopf et al. '138 patent fails to show or suggest a supporting leg extending through the internal chamber between a wheel-supporting surface and an open face to present a ground-engaging section spaced within a perimeter of the open face. Instead, the Rehkopf et al. '138 patent shows grooves 17 and 19 that merge with flange base 12. Therefore, the chock 10 has an open face but no ground-engaging section spaced within a perimeter of the open face.

For reasons similar to those noted above with respect to claim 1, the Rehkopf et al. '138 patent fails to show or suggest the use of the structure recited in new claim 37. For example, the support surface (i.e., top wall 20) slopes upwardly and rearwardly from the edge defined at the top of end wall 16. However, the central groove portion 22 extends forwardly beyond the front

Appl. No. 10/605,556

Amdt. dated February 16, 2005

Reply to Office Action of November 16, 2004

edges of the side flanged portions 24 (see FIG. 2 of the Rehkopf et al. '138 patent), as opposed to being recessed as recited in claim 37.

The Luigi '961 patent discloses a parking grip chock 1 including side walls 5, rear wall 3, and surface 7. The surface 7 includes longitudinal bosses 8,9 and flat tongue 10. The Luigi '961 patent is cited for its disclosure of the handle 2, longitudinal bosses 8, and the "L iron" 11. However, the Luigi '961 is similarly deficient in showing or suggesting the use of the structure recited in independent claims 1, 13, and 37.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that independent claims 1, 13, and 37 recite structure not shown or suggested in the prior art references of record. Claims 2-12 depend from claim 1, claims 14, 15, and 17-24 depend from claim 13, and claims 38-48 depend from claim 37. These dependent claims recite additional features of the invention not shown or suggested by the prior art.

Therefore, the present application should now be in condition for allowance and such allowance is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner have any questions, please contact the undersigned at (800) 445-3460.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees associated with this communication or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-0522.

Appl. No. 10/605,556
Amdt. dated February 16, 2005
Reply to Office Action of November 16, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

HOVEY WILLIAMS LLP

By:


Andrew G. Colombo, Reg. No. 40,565
2405 Grand Boulevard, Suite 400
Kansas City, Missouri 64108
(816) 474-9050

ATTORNEYS FOR APPLICANT